



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,376	04/19/2001	Steven Edward Atkin	AUS920010278US1	9255

45993 7590 05/18/2005

IBM CORPORATION (RHF)
C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ
P. O. BOX 23324
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/838,376

Applicant(s)

ATKIN, STEVEN EDWARD

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

4

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 01/15/2005 to the original application filed 04/19/2001.
2. Claims 1-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

Claims 1-2, 9-10, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Lincke et al.** (U.S. 6,397,259).

As to independent claim 1:

- a. Lincke teaches a method for providing metadata (*e.g., meta tag*) within a character stream (*e.g., stream*) (*col. 26, lines 51-56 and col.29, lines 10-40*), the method comprising the steps of:
- (i) encoding into one or more metatags information regarding display rendering for at least one character in a Unicode character stream (*e.g., Multiple sequences of non-lower case alpha or international characters can also be included in the stream by including the appropriate text encoding tag in the stream followed by the 8 or 16 bit (unicode) character text string; col. 25, lines 41-45*);
 - (ii) inserting the tags into the Unicode character stream by spelling at least one tag identifier (*e.g., The tag start character (1) is included in a CML stream to indicate the presence of a CML tag. The tag start character is followed by an 8 or 16 bit Tag ID structure; col. 25, lines 47-56*); and
 - (iii) inserting one or more metatags separator between adjacent metatags if more than one metatags has been inserted (*e.g., Each item in the list is ended either by a endTag character or a tagListItemCustom tag with parameters...most tiems in lists are separated by endTag characters; col.33, line 60-col.34, line 50*) without Unicode intervening between adjacent metatags, thereby producing a modified Unicode character stream having separator-delimited metadata embedded within it (see the use of *itemSeparator; col.33, line 60-col.34, line 50*).

As to dependent claims 2, 10, and 18:

Lincke teaches inserting one or more parameters following at least one tag with which it is associated (*e.g., text encoding tags are merely tags that have a variable number of parameters following them, where each "parameter" is another character in the text stream. The sequence of "parameters" ends as soon as a reset character is encountered (the endTag or startTag character; col.26, lines 31-56) and inserting a parameter separator between multiple parameters associated with a tag if more than one parameter has been inserted so as to create a separator-delimited parameter list following a tag (see itemSeparator; col.33, line 60-col.34, line 50).*

As to independent claim 9:

It is directed a computer readable medium for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 17:

It is directed a system for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 8, 11, 16, 19, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lincke et al.** (U.S. 6,397,259) in view of **Durst et al.** "Unicode in XML and other Markup Languages" (cited by Applicant's IDS).

As to dependent claims 3, 11, and 19:

- a. Durst teaches inserting an element tag describes zero width joiner and zero width non joiner characters, such that multiple characters may be grouped together for treatment as a single grapheme or text element (*e.g., Zero-width Joiners 'ZWJ and ZWNJ'; table 3.2*).
- b. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Durst in the system of Lincke because it would provided the capability for facilitating the implantation of Unicode, a standard for representing characters as integers and it is necessary for some languages such as Greek, Chinese, and Japanese.

As to dependent claim 8, 16 and 24:

- a. Durst teaches inserting a math tag and a language tag such that portions of the character stream which represent mathematical expressions are delimited from portions of the character stream which represent language (*page 14*).
- b. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Durst in the system of Lincke because it would provided the capability for facilitating the implantation of

Unicode, a standard for representing characters as integers and it is necessary for some languages such as Greek, Chinese, and Japanese.

7. Claims 4-7, 12-15, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lincke**, in view of **Durst et al.** as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above and further in view of **Davis** "Unicode Standard Annex #9 – The Bidirectional Algorithm", published 03/2001.

As to dependent claim 4, 12, and 20:

- a. The combination of Lincke and Durst does not specially teach "inserting a right-to-left or a left-to-right directional parameter following a paragraph metatag which indicate a direction in which the character stream following the paragraph metatag and parameter is to be rendered for display."
- b. Davis teaches inserting a right-to-left or a left-to-right directional parameter following a paragraph tag which indicate a direction in which the character stream following the paragraph tag and parameter is to be rendered for display (*e.g. the right-to-left and left-to-right marks; page 4, Direction Formatting Codes*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Davis in the system of Durst as modified by Lincke because it would provided the capability for facilitating the implementation of Unicode in the markup language.

As to dependent claim 5, 13, and 21:

- a. The combination of Lincke and Durst does not specially teach “inserting a right-to-left or a left-to-right directional parameter following a direction metatag which indicate a direction in which the character stream following the direction metatag and parameter is to be rendered for display.”
- b. Davis teaches inserting a right-to-left or a left-to-right directional parameter following a direction tag which indicate a direction in which the character stream following the direction tag and parameter is to be rendered for display (*e.g., the right-to-left and left-to-right marks; page 4, Direction Formatting Codes*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Davis in the system of Durst as modified by Lincke because it would provided the capability for ensuring the correct character code is used to express the intended semantic of the character.

As to dependent claim 6, 14, and 22:

- a. Durst teaches replacing hyper text markup language bidirectional output tags with the direction tags and directional parameters (*e.g., editing bi-directional HTML; page 8 and Replacement Markup table*).
- b. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Durst in the system of Lincke because it would provided the capability for ensuring the correct character code is used to express the intended semantic of the character.

As to dependent claim 7, 15, and 23:

- a. The combination of Lincke and Durst does not specially teach “teaches inserting a mirror metatag which indicates the characters following the mirror tag is to be presented in mirror fashion.”
- b. Davis teaches inserting a mirror metatag which indicates the characters following the mirror tag is to be presented in mirror fashion (*section Mirroring; page 2 – page 3*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Davis in the system of Durst as modified by Lincke because it would provided the capability for ensuring the correct character code is used to express the intended semantic of the character.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 01/15/2005 have been fully considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Herriot	U.S. Patent No. 5,929,792	issued: Jul. 27, 1999
Halstead, Jr. et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,469,648	issued: Aug. 31, 1999
Craft	U.S. Patent No. 6,070,179	issued: May 30, 2000

Whistler et al., "Language Tagging in Unicode Plain Text", ACM, January 1999, pages 1-14.

Goldsmith et al., "A Mail-Safe Transformation Format of Unicode", ACM, May 1997, pages 1-15.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
May 16, 2005


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER